

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,044	05/04/2001	Dusan Pavenik	PA-5252-RFB	9073
75	90 07/10/2006		EXAMINER	
Richard J. Goo	dlewski		STEWART	, ALVIN J
Patent Attorney				
P.O. Box 2269			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bloomington, I	N 47402-2269		3738	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- · · · ·
	09/849,044	PAVCNIK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alvin J. Stewart	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communicated Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover she	et with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communing of the provided for reply is specified above, the maximum stature of the provided period for reply with the set or extended period for reply will any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE OF THIS COMM 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, relication. tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) II, by statute, cause the application to become	UNICATION. ay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>03 April 2006</u> .		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition fo			is
closed in accordance with the practice	e under <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-9</u> is/are pending in th	ne application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-9</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requiremen	, 	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2002</u> is	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ c	bjected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objecti			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the state of the s			(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority do			
2. Certified copies of the priority de			
 Copies of the certified copies of application from the International 	•	peen received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action		not received.	
	,		
Attachment(s)	_		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-892) 		view Summary (PTO-413) r No(s)/Mail Date	
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Pi Paper No(s)/Mail Date	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	e of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 03, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant's representative disagree with the Examiner's point of view disclosing that the examiner has not shown sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and that the Examiner misinterpreted the Gregory reference because the Gregory reference does not teach the use of a SIS sleeve. Instead the Gregory reference teaches the use of an elastin-based sleeve and never mentions small intestinal submucosa.

After a careful examination of the Applicant's remarks, the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's point of view. The Examiner believes that the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness has been proved. The Examiner believes that the motivation to combine the references, the reasonable expectation of success and all the structure limitations meet the prima facie case of obviousness.

Regarding the Gregory reference, the Examiner wants to clarify the independent claims don't disclose the use of SIS.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 17 and 18, see col. 5, lines 36-48.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed April 03, 2006 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1 and 3-9 based upon Douglas in view of Gregory as set forth in the last Office action because: the Applicant's representative has not discloses factual evidence and has only discloses an opinion. While an opinion as to a legal conclusion is not entitled to any weight the underlying basis for the opinion may be persuasive. In re Chilowsky, 306 F.2d 908,134 USPQ 515 (CCPA 1962).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas US

Patent 6,090,128 in view of Gregory US Patent 5,990,379

Douglas discloses an implant comprising a plurality of stents (42) covered by a sleeve

(32, 34 & 36). The stents have proximal and a distal ends. The sleeve has a length <u>about</u> equal

to twice the length of the stent (the Examiner is referring to the two stent 42 shown in Figure 2,

that are folded with the sleeve 32). The sleeve has a first portion within the inside surface of the

stent and a second portion that is folded back over the proximal end of the stent (see element

structure 38 in Fig. 2). The second portion extends from the proximal end to the distal end,

along an outside surface of the stent (see Fig. 2). Also, the first portion and the second portion

are secured to at least the distal end of the stent (see Fig. 2, elements 40, 57, 59 61). Finally,

Douglas discloses stents having a frame comprising eyelets at the proximal and distal ends

wherein the stents are connected to each other by biocompatible filaments.

However, Douglas does not disclose a sleeve made of SIS.

Gregory teaches an implant comprising a stent (20) and a graft (16) made of extracellular

matrix. The stent has a proximal end and a distal end. The sleeve has a length about equal to

twice the length of the stent (see Figs. 8-10). The sleeve has a first portion within the inside surface of the stent and a second portion that is folded back over the proximal and distal end of the stent. The second portion extends from the proximal end to the distal end, along an outside surface of the stent (see Figs. 8-10 and col. 14, lines 31-36) for the purpose of inhibiting the migration of smooth muscle cells in the treated area (see col. 1, lines 22-31).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the material property of the Douglas reference with the SIS sleeve of the Gregory reference in order to inhibit the migration of smooth muscle cells in the treated area.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 5

examiner should be directed to Alvin J. Stewart whose telephone number is 571-272-4760. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM-5:30PM(1 Friday B-week off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALVIN J. STEWART PRIMARY EXAMINER

A - Stenat

Art Unit 3738

June 10, 2006.